

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/068,273	02/07/2002	Aravind Padmanabhan	H19 02237 US	4265	
128	7590 03/11/2005		EXAMINER		
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.			VO. HAI		
101 COLUMI P O BOX 224			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			1771		

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

İ	12	/	

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/068,273	PADMANABHAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hai Vo	1771	

Defense the Fillian of an Annual Duief							
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Hai Vo	1771					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 21 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in begappeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(I TOL-02+).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17 and 45-49</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>18-44</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
			GB				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 9-04)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the following reasons. Since "photo" refers to light and "uminescence" referes to "emission of light", photoluminescence simply means light emitting. Zakhidov does not teach the photoluminescence. However, Gole teaches a post etch treatment for enhancing and stabilizing the photoluminescence from a porous silicon (abstract). The combination of the teachings of Zakhidov and Gole will arrive at the photonic crystal having the photoluminescence properties as recited in the claims (see page 4 of the Office Action mailed 12/01/2004). Two conditions must be met to overcome the finding of obviousness. First, the recitation " photoluminescence enhanced by about ten-fold over a conventional porous structure" needs to be incorporated in the claims. Second, Applicants should provide affidavit to show that such properties are unexpected results to one skilled in the art.

Hai V. Tech Center 1700